

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California
Corporation,

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

v.

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation, INTERNET
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia
corporation, and SYMANTEC
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

C. A. No. 04-1199 (SLR)

**[PROPOSED] MULTI-PART GENERAL
VERDICT FORM**

We, the jury in the above-entitled action, unanimously find the following
general verdict on the questions submitted to us:

I. INFRINGEMENT BY DEFENDANTS

'615 Patent

1. **Direct – Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *Symantec* literally infringes the following claims of the '615 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for Symantec)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

2. **Direct – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 1, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *Symantec* infringes such claim(s) of the '615 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for Symantec)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

3. **Inducement - Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *Symantec* induces literal infringement by its customers of the following claims of the ‘615 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for Symantec)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

4. **Inducement – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered “NO” as to any claim(s) in question 3, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *Symantec* induces infringement by its customers of such claim(s) of the ‘615 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for Symantec)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

5. **Direct – Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* literally infringes the following claims of the ‘615 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

6. **Direct – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered “NO” as to any claim(s) in question 5, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* infringes such claim(s) of the ‘615 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

7. **Inducement - Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* induces literal infringement by its customers of the following claims of the '615 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

8. **Inducement – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 7, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* induces infringement by its customers of such claim(s) of the '615 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

'338 Patent

9. **Direct – Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* literally infringes the following claims of the '338 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

10. **Direct – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 9, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* infringes such claim(s) of the '338 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

11. **Inducement - Literal:** Do you find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* induces literal infringement by its customers of the following claims of the '338 patent?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

12. **Inducement – Doctrine of Equivalents:** If you answered “NO” as to any claim(s) in question 11, do you nevertheless find that SRI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that *ISS* induces infringement by its customers of such claim(s) of the '338 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	YES (for SRI)	NO (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

II. VALIDITY

'615 Patent

13. **Anticipation:** Have defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '615 patent are invalid as anticipated based on the prior art?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for defendants)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

14. **Obviousness:** Have defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '615 patent are invalid as obvious based on the prior art?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for defendants)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

15. **Best Mode:** Have defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '615 patent are invalid because of a failure by the named inventors to disclose what they believed to be the best mode of practicing their invention?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for defendants)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 2:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 13	_____	_____
Claim 14:	_____	_____
Claim 15:	_____	_____
Claim 16:	_____	_____

'338 Patent

16. **Anticipation:** Has ISS proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '338 patent are invalid as anticipated based on the prior art?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

17. **Obviousness:** Has ISS proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '338 patent are invalid as obvious based on the prior art?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for ISS)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13:	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

18. **Best Mode:** Has ISS proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '338 patent are invalid because of a failure by the named inventors to disclose what they believed to be the best mode of practicing their invention?

	NO (for SRI)	YES (for defendants)
Claim 1:	_____	_____
Claim 4:	_____	_____
Claim 5:	_____	_____
Claim 11:	_____	_____
Claim 12:	_____	_____
Claim 13	_____	_____
Claim 24:	_____	_____

Dated: _____

Jury Foreperson